

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-5 and 7 are amended. Claim 1 is amended for clarity. Support for the amendment to claim 1 is provided in the specification at least on page 2, lines 6-22 and page 7, lines 7-19. Claim 7 is amended to correct an informality. Support for the amendment to claim 7 is provided in the specification at least on page 17, lines 19-23. Claims 3 and 4 are amended to correct informalities. Claim 5 is amended to correct informalities and for clarity. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiners Coker and Dickson in the November 14, 2007 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 5 are amended to comply with the Examiners' helpful suggestions made during the interview.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 3 and 4 are allowable if the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, are overcome. Claims 3 and 4 are amended to overcome the §112 rejections and, as such are understood to be in condition for allowance.

The Office Action objects to claim 5. Claim 5 is amended as suggested in the Office Action to obviate the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to the drawings as allegedly not showing a feature recited in claim 7. Claim 7 is amended to obviate the objection. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 3, 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 3, 4 and 7 are amended to obviate the rejections. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Each of the above issues were raised with Examiners Coker and Dickson during the November 12 personal interview. The Examiners indicated that the proposed amendments appeared to overcome the various formal matters regarding this application.

The Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,679,087 to Lutz; and rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lutz in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0099455 A1 to Nagaya. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Lutz fails to disclose a suspension system for a vehicle that includes a second suspension provided between a motor and a vehicle body for elastically supporting the motor and providing independent movement of the motor with respect to the vehicle body, as recited in claim 1. The Office Action asserts that Fig. 2 of Lutz discloses a second suspension, in the form of elastic rubber mounts 29', provided between a motor 13' and a vehicle body 1'. The elastic rubber mounts 29' disclosed in Lutz appear to provide, at best, a reasonably fixed mount between the motor and the vehicle. Therefore, these elastic rubber mounts do not provide for independent movement of a motor with respect to a vehicle body. Thus, Lutz fails to disclose a suspension system for a vehicle with all of the features positively recited in claim 1. Lutz also fails to teach the combination of features recited in claim 2 for at least the dependence of claim 2 on an allowable base claim, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that claim 2 recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 103(a) based on Lutz are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Nagaya.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As shown in Fig. 50, Nagaya discloses an inwheel motor system having an inwheel motor 3 located inside a tire 2. The problems associated with an inwheel motor system are described in Applicant's specification on page 1, lines 11-22. In contrast to the suspension system for a vehicle recited in claim 5, Nagaya fails to disclose a suspension system that comprises a motor that is provided between a vehicle body and a knuckle for driving a wheel, as recited in independent claim 5. For at least the foregoing reasons, Nagaya can not reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combination of all of the features positively recited in independent claim 5. Further, claim 6 is also not taught, nor would have been suggested, by Nagaya for at least the dependence of this claim on an allowable base claim, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that this claim recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nagaya are respectfully requested.

Applicant's representative discussed each of the above rejections of claim 5 with Examiners Coker and Dickson in the November 14, 2007 personal interview. The Examiners proposed language that they indicated would overcome at least the above rejections of claim 5. Claim 5 is amended in accordance with the helpful suggestions provided by the Examiners during the personal interview. Claim 1 is amended in like manner to clarify the subject matter recited in that claim.

Because claim 7 is not otherwise indicated in the Office Action as being substantively rejected over any of the prior art references, Applicant understands that the amendment of claim 7 to overcome the formal objections and rejections indicated above places this application in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-7 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Robert M. Jackson
Registration No. 46,796

JAO:RMJ/eks

Date: November 21, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--